REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 1, 2003. Claims 1-7 and 14 are pending in this application. Non-elected Claims 8-13 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claim 14 has been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1-7 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claim 1 is in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner stated in the Office Action at page 2 that the listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement (IDS) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(b). Applicants submitted an IDS on January 30, 2004, listing all the patents, publications, or other information cited in the specification, as indicated on the enclosed stamped postcard.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention, noting that the positioning and heating steps are worded in a confusing manner, that "ryas" should read –rays–, and that there is no antecedent basis for "the beam." Applicants have amended the claims in response to this rejection and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 3, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application Laid-Open No. 11-188873 (Sato et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 5,262,232 (Wilfong); rejected Claims 2, 5, and 7 as being unpatentable over Sato et al., Wilfong and U.S. Patent No. 6,652,702 (Miyazaki et al.); and rejected Claim 4 as being unpatentable over Sato et al. in view of Wilfong and the admitted prior art. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants submit that amended independent Claim 1, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, is patentably distinct from the proposed combination of the cited prior art at least for the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is a method for manufacturing an ink jet head by bonding a member at least having a discharge port for discharging ink and a substrate having an energy generating element to generate energy for discharging ink. The method includes the step of coating, on a bonding portion between the member and the substrate, a liquid-like adhesive containing at least an ultraviolet curing cation polymeric starter and an epoxy resin having a melting point between greater than or equal to 50°C and less than or equal to 120°C. The method also includes the steps of irradiating an ultraviolet ray to the liquid-like adhesive to activate the ultraviolet curing cation polymeric starter while restricting dispersion thereof, positioning the member and the substrate at a position for bonding and applying pressure to the member and the substrate, and heating the member and the substrate at a temperature not lower than the melting point of the liquid-like adhesive to cure the liquid-like adhesive. Support in the specification for the amended features of Claim 1 can be found at least starting at page 36, line 15. (It is understood, of course, that the scope of Claim 1 is not limited to the details of this embodiment.)

Sato et al., as understood by Applicants, relates to a mixed adhesive of acrylic adhesive and epoxy adhesive being irradiated by an ultraviolet ray to cure the acrylic adhesive only, where the mixed adhesive is gel-like, and then the adhesive is heated, for example, at no less than 120°C to cure the epoxy adhesive. Wilfong, as understood by Applicants, relates to vibration-damping constructions using acrylate-containing damping materials. Wilfong discusses that the mixture of acrylic

adhesive and epoxy adhesive is irradiated by the ultraviolet ray and heated to obtain the desired adhesion. Sato et al. and Wilfong, when taken together, at most suggest that the acrylic material is cured by irradiating the ultraviolet ray and then heated for final curing. Applicants submit, however, that nothing has been found in Sato et al. or Wilfong, when taken separately or in any proper combination, that would teach or suggest the amended features of the coating step, the irradiating step, the positioning step, and the heating step, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, at least for these reasons, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, when taken separately or in any proper combination.

A review of the other art of record, including Miyazaki et al. and the Admitted Prior Art, has failed to reveal anything that, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as applied against independent Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from Claim 1 discussed above, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and the allowance of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter C. Thurlow

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 47,138

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 411613v1